United Nations A/C.1/56/PV.22

General Assembly

Fifty-sixth session

Official Records

First Committee

22nd meeting

Monday, 5 November 2001, 10 a.m.

New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdös ..... (Hungary)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Agenda items 64 to 84 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: I wish to draw the Committee's attention to informal working paper No. 5, which members have at their disposal and which is the inventory of what has to be done this morning. I wish to make two observations regarding the working paper and would ask members to make the necessary corrections and changes to it. Under cluster 1, nuclear weapons, add draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", which the Committee will be taking up this morning. Also in informal working paper No. 5, under cluster 6, confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments, draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.2 should be deleted, at least for this morning, because important consultations are being held on it. Thus, the basic number of draft resolutions to be considered will not change, but a draft decision and a draft resolution will change places between the morning and afternoon meetings.

The Committee will now proceed to consider the introduction of revised draft resolutions and to hear any general statements.

First, at this stage of our work, I wish to introduce revised draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1, which is being distributed in the various languages of the United Nations as I speak. It is entitled "Multilateral cooperation in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation and global efforts against terrorism", and is submitted by the Chairman of the Committee.

This draft resolution, one version of which, A/C.1/56/L.49, has already been distributed, is the result of a number of bilateral and multilateral consultations that I had on the subject with many members of the Committee. After the introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49 on 23 October, I continued working with various delegations to accommodate as many preoccupations, concerns and viewpoints as possible in order to find language that would be acceptable to all. It was obviously impossible for me to get in touch with each and every member on this draft, but I stood ready to listen to the views of any interested delegation. I have received a good number of ideas and proposals to improve the text. I thank all members who, with their comments and amendments, have contributed to improving this text and making it more agreeable — not perfect, but something members can live with. It has been said more than once on these premises, but I repeat it nevertheless, that a Chairman's text is valid as long as it does not give complete satisfaction to anybody. Thus, I do not expect anyone to embrace draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1 enthusiastically, or applaud it cheerfully, nor do I expect an outright rejection of it on the grounds that it is unacceptable.

What I sought to reflect in the text was a common denominator, a language one could live with, and

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

01-61893 (E)

formulations that could attain the minimum level of agreement. My basic purpose has been and is for the Committee to find draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1 an acceptable undertaking, nothing more and nothing less. I ask members to consider draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1 from that angle and — what is more important — to bear in mind the significance of what we are about to do here and now in the Committee on the subject-matter that is before us.

I spoke earlier about the particular circumstances in which our Committee, entrusted with questions of disarmament, non-proliferation and international security, has been meeting this year and hence about the need to revisit the way the Committee has been conducting its business thus far. The outpouring of human solidarity across the globe in the aftermath of the terrible tragedy in September and the sentiments that were aired here in the Committee as we launched our work early in October made this Chairman's initiative desirable and possible. Its espousal by the Committee would be indicative of a new state of mind in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation.

Let us not allow the passage of time to weaken our resolve, within this body as well, to contribute to the global endeavour to overcome the unprecedented challenges of the twenty-first century by working together hand in hand and moving ahead in a meaningful way in the areas of competence of the Committee. That is how I summarize the thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1.

More concretely, let us not allow differences and diverging vantage points to stand in the way of the adoption without a vote of this revised draft resolution. I know that some members could have added or deleted formulations, words, or commas in the draft resolution, but I ask members to look at it as a text that captures our basic preoccupations. I trust it does. As I have already said, it is of the utmost importance that we adopt this draft resolution without resorting to a vote. Let us rise to the occasion, as the challenges ahead of us are truly universal. They affect all the States represented in the Committee, whether small or big, weaker or more powerful.

Without wishing to sound too solemn, I should say that these challenges go beyond any consideration that might divide us. At this juncture of history, we are gathered here above all else as members of the human family, wishing to be counted in this common effort to preserve our future and our civilization.

I now call on delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions before the Committee takes action on them.

Mr. Bar (Israel): My general statement relates to cluster 4, conventional weapons. I would have liked to make the statement after we had talked about nuclear weapons, but nevertheless I will gladly make it now.

The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, which is dealt with in draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47, which we will discuss this morning under cluster 4, is first and foremost a humanitarian problem. It ultimately leads to the bloodshed of innocent people. It affects the basic right of people to lead their lives peacefully, without fear of getting killed simply for being in the wrong place at the wrong time. Israel had expressed its hope that the first United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects would adopt the goal of preventing the uncontrolled flow of arms, ammunition and explosives, which encourages indiscriminate attacks by terrorists and criminal organizations. The outcome of that Conference, the Programme of Action, is a first step that could contribute towards achieving that goal.

In the light of current events we wish to reiterate our position, namely that the best way to curb the illicit circulation of small arms and light weapons throughout the world is through a strong national commitment and determination supplemented by regional coordination and cooperative international efforts. Israel is of the view that proper action by States is necessary for the containment of this phenomenon. That includes the adoption by all States of a clear and explicit political commitment to bar all entities under their jurisdiction from engaging in the illicit traffic in arms, ammunition and explosives to terrorists and to withhold assistance to outside elements involved in that traffic.

The menace of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons can be substantially reduced if countries make a firm decision to stop it. As a first step, they should institute rigorous measures to control the circulation of arms within their territories as well as the transfer of arms to others. This control should be included in national legislation and effectively enforced.

Israel's legislation and regulation reflect its policy regarding the obstruction of illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons, ammunition and related technical know-how. Israeli law and export controls encompass all aspects of the firearms trade: negotiations, production, licensing, marketing and registration, and are strictly enforced. Israel's firm arms transfer policy includes tight controls aimed, inter alia, at the prohibition of exports to regions or States under a United Nations Security Council sales embargo, non-State entities, subversive and underground movements, terrorist or guerrilla groups, criminal organizations or areas of ongoing internal armed conflict between rival parties. Moreover, Israel's regulations concerning the export of small arms and light weapons obligate the exporter to apply for separate and specific licences from the relevant authorities, including negotiation permits and export licences.

In addition, Israel invests in research, development and production of new technologies and equipment to prevent the illicit smuggling of arms along its border and points of entry. Israel is willing to work with other countries in its region in coordinating efforts to limit the illicit spread of small arms and light weapons. We hope that Israel's extensive experience in this area can be utilized in a cooperative regional approach, as part of a shared global commitment to end the tragedies caused by these weapons.

The flow of arms to terrorist groups has served to fuel the conflict in our region by increasing the number of illegal arms in terrorist hands, thereby adding to human suffering, animosity and instability in the region. Terrorism, after all, is only viable if countries allow, and even support, its capabilities through weapons transfers. We wish to seize this opportunity to call upon our neighbours in all the countries in the region to adopt a responsible policy and to take the necessary measures to stop the flow of arms from their territories to terrorist groups. We expect the international community, in the context of a global campaign against terrorism, to join us in that call.

Finally, Israel views the adoption of the Programme of Action last July as an important achievement that reflects the international community's will to seriously address this problem. We hope that this political commitment will translate into firm action by States to stop the uncontrolled flow of arms, and we therefore support draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47. We believe our common interests would be best served by focusing on the implementation of the agreed Programme of Action.

Mr. Maandi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): My delegation has asked for the floor to express its point of view on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". The draft resolution, introduced by Myanmar, has been co-sponsored by my country since the first year that one was introduced. In sponsoring this draft resolution once again, Algeria wishes to reaffirm its commitment to the total elimination of nuclear weapons and the promotion of a new era based on collective and universal security, clearly differentiated from the nuclear-use theory of the past. At the same time, we wish fully to support the praiseworthy efforts continuously being undertaken to give the necessary momentum towards nuclear disarmament, which, for all of us, remains the absolute priority because of the threat nuclear weapons pose to international peace and security. The draft resolution before the Committee goes beyond the fact that we welcome what has already been achieved in the area of disarmament and the positive results of the Sixth Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 2000, especially the commitment made by the nuclear States totally to eliminate their nuclear arsenals — a commitment that we all wish to see become a reality. Indeed, it proposes a very relevant and practical series of measures to pave the way towards the achievement of the noble objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, an objective that was established by the international community in 1945 and repeated in 1978 during the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The convening of an international conference on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects to identify and deal with concrete measures of nuclear disarmament; the establishment of an ad hoc committee to commence negotiations on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament; and the commencement, in the Conference on Disarmament (CD), of negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear purposes — all constitute, in the view of my delegation, concrete proposals able to give true impetus to the nuclear disarmament process. Thus my delegation supports this draft resolution and calls upon all delegations to give it their broad support.

Ms. Badawi (Egypt): The delegation of Egypt is taking the floor to make the following general statement on cluster 4, and before the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects". The delegation of Egypt participated actively in the negotiations that led to the adoption by consensus of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. That Programme of Action reflects the international, common position guiding the global work in this field. The overwhelming majority of States believe that our future international work should be based only on and promptly bound by the agreement reached in this regard. Therefore we recognize that draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47 is the only resolution dealing with this subject, namely the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects, and will thus guide our future work and the follow-up process.

A couple of days ago, this august body adopted a draft resolution relating to the subject of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons which, regrettably, contradicts the commitment that was just undertaken in July 2001. Our concern is that this precedent may put all our international work in this field in real jeopardy and may even challenge the seriousness of our commitments before they are implemented. We believe that it is the prerogative of each State and region or subregion to adopt and implement any policy that would serve its or their interests. However, this should be confined to the concerned States or regions only.

In spite of the aforementioned concerns, the agreed language reached in the Bamako Declaration reflecting the common African position on the Programme of Action, as well as resolution 54/54 V — which I have copies of and will gladly share with interested representatives — my delegation refrained a couple of days ago from engaging in a procedural debate and formally putting forward our amendment in order to avoid questioning the seriousness of previous commitments already made in this regard, as well as reopening draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47 to further debate.

Mr. Pearson (New Zealand): I wish to make a general statement under cluster 1 on behalf of Australia, Mexico and New Zealand on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). This issue is before us today in draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1.

Australia, Mexico and New Zealand for many years have addressed the importance of a comprehensive test-ban treaty in the United Nations. We were delighted after this long advocacy that the Treaty was adopted in the United Nations on 10 September 1996. Since then our three countries have worked actively with other signatory and ratifying States to achieve its entry into force. In this context we welcome the Ministerial Conference to facilitate that goal that is to take place in New York on Sunday and will be chaired by Mexico.

Being mindful of the pre-eminence of this Conference, our objective this year in the First Committee is to achieve a consensus outcome. Our goal is simply to inscribe the CTBT on our agenda for next year. The draft decision we have tabled is therefore a very modest initiative. We amended it, removing the reference to last year's United Nations General Assembly resolution, in the expectation that we could secure a consensus. We also delayed consideration of the decision to that end. Our intentions in draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1 are transparent and straightforward, no more, no less. We therefore urge support for this draft decision.

The CTBT will contribute to international peace and security in unmistakable ways. By creating an international norm prohibiting all nuclear-weapon test explosions and any other nuclear explosions, the Treaty will make a real contribution to preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and will provide impetus to the process of their total elimination.

Ratification of the CTBT is one critically important step that all States could take now to underline their commitment to promoting our common security. Our three countries intend to table a resolution addressing this imperative at next year's session of the First Committee.

Mr. León González (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have asked for the floor to explain Cuba's position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1. My country, as it has done with similar resolutions in previous years, will vote in favour of it. We have before us a draft resolution that is one of the most complete in terms of nuclear disarmament. The text emphasizes the fundamental principles agreed upon by the international community long ago so that nuclear

disarmament should have the priority in the field of disarmament. Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1 takes up various proposals for measures that have been traditionally put forward by the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) as a means to achieve nuclear disarmament.

Nuclear weapons continue to pose the greatest challenge to the international community in the field of disarmament and arms control. Cuba greatly deplores the fact that the Conference on Disarmament, the world's single multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament, has still not been able to establish an ad hoc committee to negotiate nuclear disarmament because of the opposition of one nuclear Power. My country will continue to devote its efforts to ensuring that the Conference on Disarmament will meet the wishes of the majority of the international community, as expressed year after year during the adoption by the General Assembly of a resolution relating to nuclear disarmament.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on those draft resolutions and decisions in informal working paper No. 5 as amended at the beginning of the meeting.

I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1 before a decision is taken.

Mr. Westdal (Canada): I take the floor briefly before the vote to express Canada's support for the draft decision before the Committee in document A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty" (CTBT).

Canada has always been a strong supporter of the CTBT as a landmark achievement of the Conference on Disarmament and as a measure essential to both non-proliferation and disarmament efforts. We have been very active, together with other States, in promoting its early entry into force and we therefore regret that in the week before the Conference designed to advance this very goal, a decision on the CTBT which is purely procedural has had to be brought to a vote.

Mr. Lint (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): At the start of the meetings of the First Committee I had the opportunity as President of the European Union to make the following statement relating to draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1 on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).

"... the Union wishes to reiterate that it has spared no effort in promoting the early entry into force of the Treaty and universal accession to it. It has made over 70 representations and has also argued in support of the Treaty in all the appropriate international forums. It is firmly committed to persevering in this effort. It is with this in mind that the Union reiterates its full support for the efforts to establish the verification regime rapidly and in accordance with the Treaty. To ensure that the resolve of the international community does not weaken, its calls on all the States that have not yet done so to sign the CTBT without delay and unconditionally, particularly the 13 States on the list of 44 States whose ratification is required for the Treaty to enter into force. ...

"In line with the commitments that they assumed by signing and ratifying the CTBT, the European Union member States remain committed to the full implementation of the verification regime and the early entry into force of the Treaty."

That is the reason why member States of the Union will give their support to draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", which was introduced by the representative of New Zealand at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 22 October 2001.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus,

Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted by 140 votes to 1.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations who wish to explain their vote or position on the draft decision just adopted.

Mr. McGinnis (United States): The United States delegation asked for a vote on the decision embodied in document A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1 because the United States does not support the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). As delegations are aware, in October 1999 the United States Senate voted not to give its advice and consent to ratification of this agreement. While the Administration has no plans to seek reconsideration of the Senate's action, let me make clear that the United States intends to maintain its moratorium on nuclear testing in effect since 1992. Further, we urge all States to maintain existing moratoriums on nuclear testing.

The United States takes seriously its obligations under the arms control agreements to which we are a party. In that vein I want to reiterate and emphasize the strong support of the United States for the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). As a nuclear-weapon State, the United States understands its special responsibility under article VI of the NPT.

Ms. Frøholm (Norway): As noted in our general statement, Norway attaches the greatest importance to achieving universal adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and its early entry into force. Bringing the Treaty into force will be essential for broader efforts to reduce and eventually eliminate nuclear weapons. The upcoming article XIV Conference should be instrumental in achieving that end. Therefore Norway voted in favour of draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the next item under cluster 1, nuclear weapons, draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1.

I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on this draft resolution before a decision is taken.

Mr. Durrani (Pakistan): Pakistan is committed to the achievement of general and complete nuclear disarmament. We have in the past supported the draft resolution on nuclear disarmament introduced by Myanmar, together with the other non-aligned countries. However, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1 incorporates provisions in the sixth preambular paragraph, the final preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 6 and 9 which are inconsistent with the position of my delegation. We shall therefore be constrained to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1.

Mr. Meléndez (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I just want to ask that El Salvador be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1.

The Chairman: We have taken note of the request made by the representative of El Salvador.

Does any other delegation wish to explain its position or vote before a decision is taken? There appear to be none. The Committee will therefore proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested. There will be two votes on this draft resolution: a separate vote on operative paragraph 9 and then a vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", which was introduced by the representative of Myanmar at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 30 October 2001. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1 are contained in the draft resolution itself. In addition, El Salvador has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Committee will first take a recorded vote on operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

> "Welcomes the positive outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States, in the Final Document of the Review Conference, to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament, to which all States parties are committed under article VI of the Treaty, and the reaffirmation by the States parties that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and calls for the full and effective implementation of the steps set out in the Final Document;".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan.

Abstaining:

Cuba, France, Monaco, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1 was retained by 132 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti,

Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Cyprus, Georgia, India, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Mauritius, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, San Marino, Sweden, Ukraine.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 90 votes to 35, with 19 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Seetharam (India): My delegation has requested the floor after the vote on the draft resolution to state that my country, in view of its long-standing and unwavering commitment to nuclear disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons globally, has supported the resolution in the past. We are, however, disappointed at the turn the resolution has taken in recent years. The draft resolution has diluted a number of long-held Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and G-21 positions on nuclear disarmament which my country fully supports. Further, our views regarding the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) are well known. Therefore, we called for a separate vote on operative paragraph 9 and voted against, while abstaining on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation supports the objectives and the main thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". On the issue of nuclear disarmament, China shares many of the positions expressed in the draft resolution. These include, inter alia, the commitment to the total elimination of nuclear weapons, opposition to the nuclear deterrent doctrine characterized by the first use of nuclear weapons, the call for an unconditional commitment of nuclear-weapon States to the non-first-use of nuclear weapons and the early commencement of negotiations on an international legal instrument on the non-use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or nuclear-weapon-free zones. The Chinese delegation believes that in addition to the content of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1, the following principles and measures are also essential to the realization of the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

First, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM) is a cornerstone for maintaining the international strategic balance and stability and constitutes a base for the advancement of the process of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. It is therefore necessary to urge its States parties to comply strictly with the Treaty in its entirety.

Secondly, the countries with the largest nuclear arsenals should continue to take the lead in drastically reducing their nuclear weapons. That will help to improve the international security environment, thus making it possible for the other nuclear-weapon States to take part in the nuclear reduction process.

Thirdly, measures such as those related to nuclear transparency can only be implemented in an international environment of peace, security, stability and trust. They must be integrated into the process of nuclear disarmament and based on the principle of undiminished security for all the countries concerned. In this respect we see some insufficiencies in draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1. While we voted in favour of the draft resolution, the Chinese delegation hopes that it can be further improved with a view to moving the process of nuclear disarmament forward.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". As I stated in my explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45, concerning the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ), it is Japan's fervent desire and its firm belief that the use of nuclear weapons should not be repeated and that continuous efforts should be made towards achieving a world free of nuclear weapons. Having said that, as far as draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1 is concerned, I should like to state the following: my delegation notices a number of positive elements concerning nuclear disarmament in this draft resolution. For example, it rightly contains a reference to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a cornerstone of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. My delegation also appreciates that the draft resolution incorporates some steps of nuclear disarmament agreed in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference. However, the draft resolution does not command the full support of my Government. We made the difficult choice to abstain in the voting. One reason is that it still contains the element of a specified time frame for nuclear disarmament. My delegation firmly believes that steps for nuclear disarmament should be realistic and progressive with the involvement of the nuclear-weapon States from the very beginning of the process. Therefore my delegation takes a somewhat different approach from the draft resolution towards the shared goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to explain its position or vote on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on the next item in informal working paper No. 5, draft decision A/C.1/56/L.60, entitled "United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament".

I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. León González (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba was prepared to support the draft in document [A/C.1/56/L.16]. The text would immediately follow through on the expressed desire embodied in the Declaration of the Millennium Summit by our leaders last year, in which they stated, among other things, in the list of major issues:

> "To strive for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, and to keep all options open for achieving this aim, including the possibility of convening an international conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers". (*resolution 55/2, United Nations Millennium Declaration, para. 9, ninth subparagraph*)

Cuba does not share the view that this conference would block other discussions on nuclear disarmament that have been unfolding in other forums. Nor do we support the idea that the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty constitutes the basis for efforts towards nuclear disarmament. The fact that we still have more than 30,000 nuclear weapons after more than 30 years of the NPT's existence shows, we feel, that the effectiveness of that regime leaves much to be desired. The holding of an international conference to discuss the matter of nuclear disarmament has been a long-standing proposal proffered by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. Ever since it was first put forward, Cuba has supported it.

It is imperative for us once again to discuss the issue of nuclear disarmament, not to belittle everything that has already been achieved, including valid principles and gains in terms of nuclear disarmament, but to look towards the future from our vantage point here at the beginning of the third millennium. Cuba supports the convening of a United Nations conference to identify appropriate ways to eliminate nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament. It is our view that the inclusion of this item on the General Assembly's agenda will mark a first step in that direction.

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to explain its position or vote before action is taken on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.60, the Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.60.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.60, entitled "United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament", which was

introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 2 November 2001.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

France, Germany, Israel, Monaco, Poland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, Yugoslavia.

Draft decision A/C.1/56/L.60 was adopted by 101 votes to 7, with 34 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft decision just adopted.

Mr. Broucher (United Kingdom): I take the floor to explain our vote against draft decision A/C.1/56/L.60. I have the honour also to speak on behalf of France and the United States.

Like Mexico and most other countries, the United Kingdom, France and the United States are committed to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) process as the cornerstone of nuclear non-proliferation and the essential foundation for nuclear disarmament. We believe that to establish a separate process would conflict with this approach. For that reason we do not think that the conference, originally proposed in document A/C.1/56/L.16, would contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament. We think it unlikely that further discussion at the fifty-seventh session would lead us to change this view. We have therefore voted against the decision.

Mr. Heinsberg (Germany): Like Mexico, Germany is concerned about the continued risk for humanity represented by the possibility that nuclear weapons could be used. We therefore reaffirm our determination to contribute to the implementation of article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The NPT is the cornerstone of the non-proliferation regime and the essential foundation for the pursuit of nuclear disarmament. We particularly stress the need for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for a systematic and progressive effort to implement article VI of the NPT, as agreed at the 2000 NPT Review Conference. The implementation of these 13 steps requires focused efforts. Nothing should distract us from the obligations we undertook as parties to the NPT. Thus, we consider pursuit of these efforts within the context of the NPT process leading up to the next review conference in 2005 to be of key importance. Likewise, we deem it to be of the utmost urgency to overcome the deadlock in the work of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Linkages which have led to the deadlock should be abandoned with a view to starting negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty as rapidly as possible.

In light of these priorities, and with a view not to undermine the NPT process or the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral negotiating forum,

we do not consider it appropriate at this juncture to convene a United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament. Therefore, my delegation was not in a position to support the draft decision.

Mr. Bar (Israel): I take the floor in order to explain the vote of Israel against this draft decision. Naturally, Israel does not object in principle to a discussion of ways to eliminate nuclear danger or of eventual nuclear disarmament, but given the present politicized environment surrounding discussions of nuclear issues and the platform that they give for singling out countries, as reflected again in the Committee's draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", we do not believe that such a discussion would be a constructive one.

The Chairman: That seems to conclude this series of statements after the adoption of draft decision A/C.1/56/L.60.

The Committee will now proceed to cluster 4, conventional weapons, and take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47.

Mr. Durrani (Pakistan): We are happy to note the success of the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, held in July this year. The Programme of Action adopted by the Conference may not be perfect, but it is a significant step forward. In our view, efforts now should focus on its implementation. Ambitions to achieve more and quickly, though understandable, may turn out to be counter-productive at this stage. We should move slowly but steadily. Pakistan is already in the process of implementing the Programme of Action. The Government of Pakistan recently launched a massive campaign to collect illicit weapons. At the same time the Government has stopped issuing licences for new weapons, while a ban on the display of weapons has also been imposed and is being implemented completely and vigorously. We are confident that our efforts will produce good results, cleansing our society of the repercussions of the two decades of conflict in Afghanistan. Pakistan, therefore, will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Aho-Glele (Benin) (*spoke in French*): I would like to request that Benin be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: We will act accordingly.

Mr. Meléndez (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to ask that El Salvador also be added to the list of sponsors of this draft resolution.

The Chairman: We will act accordingly.

Ms. Shodeinde (Nigeria): Nigeria wishes to be added to the list of sponsors of this draft resolution.

The Chairman: We will act accordingly.

Ms. Matsuo de Claverol (Paraguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): Paraguay wishes to join the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: We will act accordingly. The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects", which was introduced by the representative of Colombia at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 26 October 2001. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/56/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, El Salvador, Finland, Jamaica, Mali, Mauritius, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Russian Federation, Senegal and Ukraine. The programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47 are contained in document A/C.1/56/L.61.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. McGinnis (United States): The United States is committed to countering the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. We are proud of our record and pleased that the Programme of Action from July's Conference encourages all nations to adopt similar practices for effective export and import controls, restraint in trade to regions of conflict, observance and enforcement of United Nations Security Council embargoes, the strict regulation of arms brokers, transparency in exports, and improving the security of stockpiles and destruction of excess stocks. These measures taken together form the core of a regime that, if implemented by all countries, would greatly mitigate the problems caused by the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. And — what is important — we are pleased that this draft resolution will move the Programme of Action forward. For that reason we have joined the consensus on the draft resolution.

We are also committed to budget discipline at the United Nations. We must all keep a careful eye on our budget priorities and maintain a critical perspective on those areas we can make more efficient and more effective. The United States believes that the programme budget implication analysis for this draft resolution requires additional discussion. However, because of the importance of the substantive elements of this draft resolution, the United States has chosen to join the consensus and will address the financial elements of the document in the Fifth Committee.

Ms. Raholinirina (Madagascar) (*spoke in French*): I wish to express Madagascar's desire to join the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47.

The Chairman (*spoke in French*): We will act accordingly.

Mr. Lézona (Congo) (*spoke in French*): Congo would also like to join the list of sponsors.

The Chairman: We will act accordingly.

Mr. Fils-Aimé (Haiti): I should like to ask that Haiti be added to the list of sponsors.

The Chairman (*spoke in French*): We will act accordingly.

The Chairman: I suggest that the Committee now proceed under cluster 7, disarmament machinery, to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.29, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa".

I call first on delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.29 before a decision is taken. There appear to be none.

The Committee will, therefore, now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.29.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.29, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa", which was introduced by the representative of Sudan on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 29 October 2001.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.29 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.29 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee has come to the end of this morning's programme. So far as this afternoon is concerned, I have had a request for the floor from the delegation of Japan.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1, we are still engaged in last-minute consultations with a few delegations. If I may, I should like, at the beginning of this afternoon's meeting, to introduce orally a very small technical revision as Rev.2. I hope to be able to explain the reason at that time so that the Committee will be able to consider it and take action on it at the end of the day.

The Chairman: Before adjourning the meeting I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee who has an announcement to make.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to inform the Committee that Australia and Lebanon have joined the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.